

MR2349-987

Serial Number: 10/774,479

Reply to Office Action dated 22 September 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached two Drawing sheets include changes to Figures 3 and 4, and replace original Drawing sheets that included Figures 3 and 4 thereon. In each of Figures 3 and 4, the reference numerals 11, 12 and 13 associated with an AND gate, as being superfluous. Therefore, the reference numeral 12 refers only to the wave form shaping circuit of Fig. 3.

Attachment: two replacement sheets

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 22 September 2005. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the language thereof and the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Claim 10 has been amended to place it in proper form and Claim 2 has been canceled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has objected to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), because the Drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the Claims. Therefore, the Examiner stated that the “IC pins” in Claim 10 must be shown or the feature canceled from the Claim. The Examiner further objected to the Drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4), because the reference numeral character “12” in Fig. 3 was used to designate both the wave form circuit and an input to the AND gate 24.

It is respectfully submitted that Fig. 4 discloses a control integrated circuit having a plurality of terminals, identified as pins in the Specification, which are labeled in correspondence with their function. Claim 10 has been amended to now define the terminals of the integrated circuit along with the labels associated therewith. Therefore, no correction to the Drawing is required.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Takaji, et al., U.S. Patent 6,650,552. However, the

MR2349-987

Serial Number: 10/774,479

Reply to Office Action dated 22 September 2005

Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 2-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the subject matter of Claim 2 has been incorporated into Claim 1, thereby effectively rewriting Claim 2 in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Therefore, Claim 1 should now be allowable. As Claims 3-10 are now dependent upon an allowable base claim, those Claims should no longer be objected to.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *16 Dec. 2005*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586